APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/636,706	04/23/96	WOLLRATH	F1189

LM21/0223

RICHARD A JORDAN
P.O.BOX 81363
WELLESLEY MA 02181-0004

EXAMINER
CALDWELL,F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2755	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire ____3____ month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) *1-33* _____ is/are pending in the application.

   Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) *1-33* _____ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

   ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None   of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

      ☐ received.

      ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

      ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   *Certified copies not received: _____ .

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1.   The specification is objected to because US Patent Application, Waldo et al,

"System and Method for Generating Identifiers for Uniquely Identifying Object

Types for Objects Used in Processing of Object-Oriented Programs and the Like",

which is incorporated by reference is listed without a serial number. Correction is

required.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102

that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3.   Claims 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated

by Betz, Mark, "Interoperable objects: laying the foundation for distributed-

object computing", Dr. Dobb's Journal, v19, n11, p18(13).

As per **claims 31 and 32**, Betz teaches computer (machine under a single operating

system)[page 4 of enclosed copy, lines 14-22], stub retrieval (remote procedure call)

for controlling computer to initiate retrieval of stub, stub loader (dynamic invocation

interface) for controlling computer to load stub into execution environment to make

stub available for use in remote invocation [page 3 of enclosed copy, first full

paragraph of page; pages 7-8 of enclosed copy, section Architecture of the Orb].

As per **claim 33**, refer to claim 31 for rejection and combination of references. It

would have been obvious to embody these limitations as code store on a computer

readable medium and executable by a computer.

4.   Claims 1-3-4, 7-11, 13-14,17-21, 23-24, 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rosenberry , Ward et al, Understanding DCE, Chapters 1-3, 6, 1992.

As per **claim 1**, Rosenberry et al teach stub retriever for initiating retrieval of stub and stub loader for loading stub into execution environment (remote procedure call software which set-ups and performs communication between client and server, including runtime library dispatching call to function for stub, determining hosts addresses and transmitting between the addresses) [pages 42-44, section 3.1.2].

As per **claim 3**, Rosenberry et al teach remote method invocation control (remote procedure call runtime routines) for controlling invocation of remote method [page 43, section Stub Code and Run-time Libraries ...].

As per **claim 4**, Rosenberry et al teach server for processing remote method in response to a processing request, (server receiving remote procedure call), server providing stub in response to a retrieval request (server executing call and passing results back in a server stub) [page 43, section Server Invokes the Remote Procedure].

As per **claim 7**, Rosenberry et al teach remote server identifier (host address) for

providing server identification [page 49, section 3.4.1].

As per **claim 8**, Rosenberry et al teach remote method server identifier (endpoint)

[pages 48-49, sections 3.4, 3.4.1. 3.4.2].

As per **claim 9**, Rosenberry et al teach remote method invocation identification

(remote procedure calls) for controlling invocation of remote method [page 53,

section 3.5, including Figure 3-7].

As per **claim 10**, Rosenberry et al teach nameserver (DCE directory service) for

providing server identification and remote server identifier (host address) initiating

communication with nameserver to obtain the server identification of remote method

(hosts binds with each other) [page 48-50, sections 3.4 through 3.4.4]

As per **claims 11, 13-14, 17-20**, refer to claims 1, 3-4, 7-10 for rejection and

combination of references. It would have been obvious to embody these limitations

as a method.

As per claims **21, 23-24, 27-30**, refer to claims 1, 3-4,7-10 for rejection and

combination of references. It would have been obvious to embody these limitations

as a computer program product.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims **2, 5, 6, 12, 15, 16, 22, 25, 26 are rejected under 35**

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over   Rosenberry , Ward et al,

Understanding DCE, Chapters 1-3, 6, 1992. In view of Mitchell, James et al,

An Overview of the Spring System, Proceedings of Compcon, February 1994.

As per **claim 2**, Rosenberry et al do not teach remote method reference detector for

detecting whether remote method reference has been received in execution

environment.

Mitchell et al teach a remote method reference detector (server creating an object

reference) [page 5, section 7, last paragraph of page through page 6, line 4].

It would have been obvious to include within the system as taught by Rosenberry et

al a method reference detector as taught by Mitchell because its provides the

capability of guaranteeing that the correct data is being accessed.

As per **claim 5**, Rosenberry et al do not teach providing a separate address space for

processing remote method from address space provided by execution environment .

Mitchell et al teach separate address space (servers operating in different address

spaces from their clients) [page 3, section 3.1].

It would have been obvious to include with the system as taught by Rosenberry et al

the capability of separate address space because it provides a mechanism for

protecting applications against interfering with each other.

As per **claim 6**, Rosenberry et al in combination with Mitchell et al teach address space provided by server and execution environment are provided by separate computers (distribution of applications across computer systems) [Rosenberry : page 10, section 1.2.2, first para.; pages 11-12, section 1.2.3, including Figure 1-4].

As per claims **12,15,16**, refer to claims 2,5,6 for rejection and combination of references. It would have been obvious to embody these limitations as a method.

As per claims **22,25,26**, refer to claims 2,5,6 for rejection and combination of references. It would have been obvious to embody these limitations as a computer program product.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pat Caldwell whose telephone number is (703) 305-3805.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 305-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 305-9051/52 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal

Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).